

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 95-2867**

---

GINGER L. YOUNG,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SHIRLEY S. CHATER, COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Chief District Judge. (CA-94-481-F)

---

Argued: December 5, 1996

Decided: January 3, 1997

---

Before WILKINS and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**ARGUED:** H. Russell Vick, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellant. Barbara Dickerson Kocher, Assistant United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee. **ON BRIEF:** Janice McKenzie Cole, United States Attorney, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Ginger L. Young pursued a claim for supplemental security income and disability insurance benefits under the Social Security Act, alleging that she was disabled due to back pain and mental health problems. An administrative law judge (ALJ) denied benefits, reasoning that Young was not disabled because her medical problems did not prevent her from performing her past relevant work and that her subjective complaints of pain were not credible. After the Appeals Council denied review, Young filed the present petition. The district court held that the decision of the ALJ was legally correct, supported by substantial evidence, and should be affirmed. See Craig v. Chater, 76 F.3d 585, 589 (4th Cir. 1996) ("Under the Social Security Act, [federal courts] must uphold the factual findings of the Secretary if they are supported by substantial evidence and were reached through application of the correct legal standard.").

Young now appeals, asserting that the ALJ erred in determining that she could return to her past relevant work and in finding that her subjective complaints of pain were not fully credible. Having carefully considered the arguments of the parties and the record, we conclude that the district court was correct and affirm on its reasoning. Young v. Shalala, No. 94-481 (E.D.N.C. Aug. 16, 1995).

AFFIRMED